UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,180	01/23/2004	Daniel ManHung Wong	50277-2405	7861

29989 7590 02/09/2007		EXAMINER
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP		NGUYEN, CAM LINH T
2055 GATEWAY PLACE		
SUITE 550	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN JOSE, CA 95110	2161	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/764,180	WONG, DANIEL MANHUNG
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CamLinh Nguyen	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 January 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1, 4 – 10, 13, and 16 - 18</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1, 4 – 10, 13, and 16 - 18</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>23 January 2004</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/22/07</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is response to communication filed on 1/22/2007.

2.   Applicant's amendments to claims 1 – 18 are acknowledged. Consequently, rejection to

claims 1 – 8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is withdrawn. Claims 2 – 3, 11 – 12, 14 – 15

have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4 – 10, 13, and 16 - 18 are currently pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 1/22/2007 is in compliance

with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98, and MPEP §600. Accordingly, the information

disclosure statement has been placed in the application file and is being considered by the

examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5.   Claims 1, 4 – 10, 13, and 16 - 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated

by Fujiwara et al (U.S. 2003/0014394 A1).

♦ As per claims 1, 10

Fujiwara discloses a machine-implemented method, a machine-readable medium (Fig. 7 of

Fujiwara) for managing access to data, the method comprising the steps of:

- "Registering with a database server a policy function supplied by a user" See Fig. 12, in

    particular:

    - A database server corresponds to database server 722 (See Fig. 7, element 722,

        paragraph 0040). Fujiwara teaches "a single computer system can be used to host

        all three servers components in a small scale operation" (page 3, paragraph 0041).

        Therefore, the Examiner would interpret the reference as single computers sever.

    - A policy function corresponds to the access policy (Fig. 8) that is registered or

        stored in the database server computer and is provided by the user (administrator

        personnel or database management personnel) (See paragraph 0044)

- "Said database server detecting that a database command requires access to columns in at

    least two tables" corresponds to the command send from a user using a third computer

    system (Fig. 11 wherein the command specified multiple columns, page 3, paragraph

    0042, page 6 paragraph 0068 of Fujiwara). Fujiwara discloses a SELECT statement that

    can select multiple tables (Fig. 11). Therefore, clearly this command requires access to

    columns in at least two tables as claimed in claims invention.

- " And in response to the step of detecting, said database server invoking of said policy

    function to generate a condition expression returned by the policy function" See Fig. 12

    wherein the query is modified by the access policies (page 6, paragraph 0071 - 0074).

    The "condition expression returned by the policy function" corresponds to the mask

    function as specified in table II (page 6). In addition to this user defined function, there is

    another user defined function in the DBMS (Fig. 12, element 1212, page 6, paragraph

    0074)

- "Rewriting said database command by creating a modified database command to incorporate said condition expression, based on the database command" see page 6, paragraph 0074 wherein the original query is translated (Fig. 12, query 1202 is a rewriting query) to a translated query (modified database command) that incorporate said condition expression (mask functions).

♦ As per claims 4, 13, Fujiwara discloses:

- "Wherein the policy is not triggered by detecting that a database command requires access to a subset of tables of the at least two tables, wherein the subset of tables includes at least one table" corresponds to the query that specified one or more columns in a certain table (See paragraph 0068 of Fujiwara).

♦ As per claims 7, 16, Fujiwara discloses:

- "Wherein the detecting includes detecting that metadata defines the particular combination of columns as a combination of columns to which access is controlled" as indicated above, Fujiwara teaches that the user issues a query that is a combination of columns (paragraph 0068 of Fujiwara) and the access is controlled by including the mask function to mask out some data that the user does not have access permit (paragraph 0075 of Fujiwara).

♦ As per claims 8, 17, Fujiwara discloses:

- "Further comprising the step of registering a policy function with a policy, wherein the policy function returns a condition expression, and the modified database command is based on the condition expression and the database command" since the mask functions

in the package mask are stored in the web/report server (Fig. 6 - 7 of Fujiwara), the

policy must be registered in order to carry out the invention.

♦ As per claims 9, 18, Fujiwara discloses:

- "Wherein the policy includes metadata identifying columns that are included in the

    particular combination of information" See Fig. 10 – 13 of Fujiwara wherein the policy

    includes metadata identifying columns (such as PT_ID) that are included in the particular

    combination of information (different tables).

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed 1/22/2007 have been fully considered but they are not.

persuasive.

♦ Applicant argues that "Triggering re-writing a database command responsive to detecting that

at least two columns from different tables are being accessed, as claimed, differs from Fujiwara,

in which only a single column is involved". The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As discussed above, Fujiwara discloses a SELECT statement that can select multiple

tables (Fig. 11). Therefore, clearly this command requires access two or more columns in at least

two tables as claimed in claims invention. The query is triggered to rewrite the query based on

the access policy. Therefore, Fujiwara discloses ""Triggering re-writing a database command

responsive to detecting that at least two columns from different tables are being accessed, as

claimed".

♦ Applicant argues that "Modifying a query with a database server, as claimed, also differs from

Fujiwara, in which queries are re-written before (e.g., in another part of a system from) a

database server, database management system (DBMS), etc.". The Examiner respectfully

disagrees.

Fujiwara teaches "a single computer system can be used to host all three servers

components in a small scale operation" (page 3, paragraph 0041). Therefore, the Examiner

would interpret the database servers in the reference as single computers sever. Therefore, the

queries are re-written in the database server, not another part of a system.

♦ Applicant argues that "User defined policy functions that return expressions, which are

incorporated into a query, as claimed, further differs from Fujiwara, in which a user defined

function returns a value for a column, which is in the results, and the output functions of

Fujiwara are not incorporated in a query". The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Applicant did not clearly defined how the user defined policy functions that return

expressions are differed with the user defined function returns a value for a column. As seen in

Fig. 12, the query is rewritten to corporate the mask functions into the query which is derived

from the policy function. Therefore, the mask function is the user defined policy functions that

return expressions as claimed in the invention.

Conclusion

7.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to CamLinh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272 - 4024.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on (571) 272 - 4080. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571 – 273 - 8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nguyen, Cam-Linh

Art Unit 2161

LN